

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

GRANT COUNTY BLACK SANDS
IRRIGATION DISTRICT
(GCBSID), a Washington municipal
corporation; and WILLIAMSON
LAND COMPANY, a Washington
Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION;
DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary of
the Interior of the United States of
America; WILLIAM E. RINNE in
his individual capacity; WILLIAM E.
RINNE, Acting Commissioner of the
Bureau of Reclamation; J. WILLIAM
MCDONALD in his individual
capacity; J. WILLIAM
MCDONALD, in his capacity as
Regional Director of the Pacific
Northwest Region of the Bureau of
Reclamation,

Defendants.

NO. CV-06-204-RHW

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for New Trial (Ct. Rec. 188). The motion was heard without oral argument.

On March 7, 2008, the Court granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and denied Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. On March 21, 2008, Plaintiffs' filed their Motion for New Trial. Plaintiffs ask the Court to order a new trial, or in the alternative, amend the judgment because the Court erred in

1 dismissing the Plaintiffs' claims.

2 Fed. R. Civ. P. 59 does not specify the grounds on which a motion for a new
3 trial or motion for reconsideration may be granted, but allows new trials to be
4 granted for historically recognized grounds. *Shimko v. Guenther*, 505 F.3d 987,
5 993 (9th Cir. 2007). "The trial court may grant a new trial only if the verdict is
6 contrary to the clear weight of the evidence, is based upon false or perjurious
7 evidence, or to prevent a miscarriage of justice." *Id.* (citations omitted).

8 "[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual
9 circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered
10 evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the
11 controlling law." *Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890
12 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting *389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665
13 (9th Cir. 1999)). It is considered an "extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in
14 the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." *Id.* A motion
15 under Rule 59(e) "may *not* be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the
16 first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation." *Id.*
17 (emphasis in original).

18 Plaintiffs have not presented the Court with newly discovered evidence or an
19 intervening change in controlling law. Rather, Plaintiffs attempt to re-argue their
20 position that the Court has already considered when it denied their motions for
21 summary judgment.

22 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

23 1. Plaintiffs' Motion for New Trial (Ct. Rec. 188) is **DENIED**.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is directed to enter this
2 Order and to provide copies to counsel.

3 **DATED** this 25th day of March, 2008.

4
5
6 *s/Robert H. Whaley*

7 ROBERT H. WHALEY
8 Chief United States District Court

9
10 Q:\CIVIL\2006\Grant County Black Sands\deny.wpd
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28